



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

to time and place contracts will be deemed void as in restraint of trade if conditions are such as will affect monopoly, stifle competition, or otherwise operate against public policy. *Western Wooden Ware Asso. v. Starkey*, 84 Mich., 76. Restriction as to place has been held in the United States Courts not to mean within State boundaries; *Oregon Steam Navigation Co. v. Winsor*, 87 U. S., 64; although the general rule is that restriction as to an entire State is void. *Consumers Oil Co. v. Nunnemaker*, 142 Ind., 560; *Taylor v. Blanchard*, 95 Mass., 370. Agreements limiting as to time and unlimited as to place are held valid if the conditions are such as warrant such clauses, so that the party from whom the consideration moves will not be prejudiced. *Callahan v. Donnelly*, 45 Cal., 152. Where the contract is unlimited or indefinite as to time it will not be held invalid if limited as to location; *Cook v. Johnson*, 47 Conn., 175; *Smith v. Brown*, 164 Mass., 584; but where there was no limitation as to the time in respect to a subject matter local in its nature, where limitation or non-limitation as to extent of territory was necessary, it was held to be void as in restraint of trade and against public policy. *Ford v. Gregson*, 7 Mont., 89. Contracts in restraint of trade and unrestricted as to time and place are void. *Alger v. Thatcher*, 36 Mass. (19 Pick.), 51; *Albright v. Teas*, 37 N. J. Eq. (10 Stew.), 171.

CONTRACTS—PARTIES—PROMISE FOR BENEFIT OF THIRD PERSON.—SHEPARD V. BRIDGES, ET AL., 74 S. E., (GA.), 245.—*Held*, that where one person for a valuable consideration, agrees with another to pay the debts of the latter, this alone does not authorize a creditor of the promisee to bring an action at law against the promisor to recover the debt.

The English rule is that a stranger to the consideration can maintain no action upon a contract; *Crow v. Rogers*, 1 Stra., 592; *Price v. Easton*, 4 B. & Ad., 433; and there is no exception made even in the case of parties closely related. *Gandy v. Gandy*, 30 Ch. Div., 57. Early Massachusetts cases opposed the English doctrine; *Felton v. Dickenson*, 10 Mass., 287; but later the English rule was adopted. *Mellon v. Whipple*, 1 Gray (Mass.), 317; *Marston v. Biglow*, 150 Mass., 45. A few other States favor the theory of the English decisions. *Butterfield v. Hartshorn*, 7 N. H., 345; *Crampton v. Ballard*, 10 Ver., 251. The New York Courts, however, early maintained the right of a third person to sue on the contract, and this is the present weight of authority in this country. *Mason v. Hall*, 30 Ala., 599; *Lawrence v. Fox*, 20 N. Y., 268. But even these Courts hold such third person must have some legal or equitable interest in the performance of the contract. *Carter v. Darby*, 15 Ala., 696; *Lowe v. Turpie*, 147 Ind., 652. Virginia leaves the question still open. *Willard v. Worsham*, 76 Va., 392; *Jones v. Thomas*, 21 Gratt. (Va.), 101. And in Connecticut, Maryland, and Pennsylvania, though the general rule is there regarded as the English rule, still the exceptions to it are so numerous that in reality they rather follow the general American doctrine. *Meech v. Ensign*, 49 Conn., 191; *Seigman v. Hoffacker*, 57 Md., 321; *Merriman v. Moore*, 90 Pa. St., 78.